

REMARKS

Claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, and 41-45 are presently pending in this application. Claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, and 41-45 have been amended to clarify certain features of these claims to expedite prosecution of this application, and without prejudice to pursuing these claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application. Claims 21, 38, and 40 have been canceled in this response without commenting on or conceding to the merits of the rejection of these claims.

In the November 1, 2007, Office Action, claims 18-45 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 18, 19, 21-24, 40-42, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,008 to Beckert et al. ("Beckert '008");

(B) Claims 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Beckert '008 including U.S. Patent No. 5,794,164 to Beckert et al. ("Beckert '164"), which is incorporated by reference in Beckert '008;

(C) Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008;

(D) Claims 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,056 to Kagle et al. ("Kagle");

(E) Claims 26, 31, 36, and 41-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,638 to Jones et al. ("Jones"); and

(F) Claims 37 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of Kagle.

The undersigned attorney and his colleague, Cameron Pilling, wish to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on January 9, 2008, to discuss the

present Office Action, the Beckert '008, Kagle, and Jones references, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the January 9th telephone conference, and they also reflect the agreements reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the telephone conference. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that Beckert '008 cannot support a Section 102 rejection of amended claim 18.

A. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 18, 19, 21-24, 40-42, 44, and 45 (Beckert '008)

Claims 18, 19, 21-24, 40-42, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Beckert '008. Claims 21 and 40 have been canceled and, accordingly, the rejection of these claims is now moot. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the January 9th telephone conference that Beckert '008 cannot support a Section 102 rejection of claim 18. Accordingly, in light of this agreement, the Section 102 rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 22-24 depend from base claim 18. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 19 and 22-24 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claim 18, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

Independent claims 27, 32, and 41 include several features generally similar to those of claim 18 (e.g., an optical media device that includes an output port configured to output video and/or audio data directly to a video and/or audio output device). Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 27, 32, and 41 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18, and for the additional features of these independent claims.

Claims 42, 44, and 45 depend from base claim 41. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 42, 44, and 45 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claim 41, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

B. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 28 and 33 (Beckert '008 and Beckert '164)

Claims 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Beckert '008 including Beckert '164, which is incorporated by reference in Beckert '008. Claim 28 depends from base claim 27, and claim 33 depends from base claim 32. As discussed above, claims 27 and 33 are allowable. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 28 and 33 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38, and 39 (Beckert '008)

Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008. Claim 38 has been canceled in this response and accordingly, the rejection of this claim is now moot. As stated above, independent claims 27 and 32 include several features generally similar to those of claim 18. Accordingly, Beckert '008 cannot support a Section 103 rejection of independent claims 27 and 32 for at least the reason that Beckert '008 cannot support a Section 103 rejection of claim 18, and for the additional features of these claims. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 27 and 32 should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-30 depend from base claim 27, and claims 33-36 and 39 depend from base claim 32. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 28-30, 33-36, and 39 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

D. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 20 and 26 (Beckert '008 and Kagle)

Claims 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of Kagle. Claims 20 and 26 depend from base claim 18. The Office Action relies on Kagle for disclosing decompressing processes of MPEG layer 2 and/or layer 3. (Office Action, page 11.) Kagle, however, fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckert '008. For example, Kagle fails to disclose or suggest an optical media device having an output port that is configured to output video and/or audio data directly to an output device. Accordingly, claims 20 and 26 are allowable over the combination of Beckert '008 and Kagle for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 18, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 20 and 26. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 20 and 26 should be withdrawn.

E. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 25, 31, 36, and 41-45 (Beckert '008 and Jones)

Claims 25, 31, 36, and 41-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of Jones. Claim 25 depends from base claim 18, claim 31 depends from base claim 27, claim 36 depends from base claim 32, and claims 42-45 depend from base claim 41. As noted above, allowable base claims 27, 32, and 41 include several features generally similar to those of base claim 18. The Office Action relies on Jones for disclosing a memory card format that is a secure digital card. (Office Action, p. 13.) Jones, however, fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckert '008. For example, Jones fails to disclose or suggest an optical media device having an output port that is configured to output video and/or audio data directly to an output device. Accordingly, claims 25, 31, 36, and 41-45 are allowable over the combination of Beckert '008 and Jones for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 18, 27, 32, and 41, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 25, 31, 36, and 42-45. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 25, 31, 36, and 41-45 should be withdrawn.

F. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 37 and 43 (Beckert '008 and Kagle)

Claims 37 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Beckert '008 in view of Kagle. Claim 37 depends from base claim 32, and claim 43 depends from base claim 41. As stated above, Kagle fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beckert '008 to properly support a Section 103 rejection. Accordingly, claims 37 and 43 are allowable over the combination of Beckert '008 and Kagle for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or disclose the features of base claims 32 and 41, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 37 and 43. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claims 37 and 43 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 359-3982.

Dated: February 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron J. Poledna

Registration No.: 54,675

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant